



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Kiichiro ITO

Serial No.: 10/665,260

Group Art Unit: 3677

Filed: September 22, 2003

Examiner: Jackson, Andre L.

For: STRING TYPE AIR DAMPER

Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Sir:

In response to the requirement that a statement of the substance of an interview be placed in the record, Applicants hereby submit the following.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner Andre' L. Jackson for taking time from his busy schedule to conduct a personal interview on November 22, 2005, for the above-referenced Application. The interview was courteous and professional, and it is believed by Applicants' representative that prosecution has been advanced because of this interview.

Concerning the substance of the interview, Applicants' representative began by presenting a brief summary of the features of the various aspects of the claimed invention, in particular the features of independent claims 1, 2, 3 and 5. Applicants' representative then presented the differences between the claimed invention and the cited prior art.


Applicants' representative argued that the Arisaka reference did not teach or suggest that the piston and the string member may be integrally formed and that the string member branches into a plurality of portions, as in claim 2, or that the string member and cap member may be integrally formed, as in claim 5. The Examiner indicated that the features could be construed as integrally formed, but noted that Arisaka did not teach a one-piece string member and piston combination or a one-piece string member and cap combination.

Applicants' representative next argued that the Seiichi reference did not teach or suggest the piston and the string member being integrally formed, the string member having a belt shape, and the guide hole having a flat opening and a smooth arcuate face continuing to a wide width edge of the opening, as in claim 3. The Examiner indicated that the description of the string member as "belt-shaped" could be construed multiple ways and suggested clarification of the claim language.

Finally, Applicants' representative argued that the Bivens reference did not teach or suggest a reinforcing plate made of a material which is different than a material of the piston and string member and is attached to the piston to serve as a mount for receiving the helical spring, as in claim 1. The Examiner indicated that "attached" does not necessary mean a separate element and that the selection of a suitable material for the reinforcement plate would be obvious.

The Examiner indicated his appreciation of the summary and indicated he would consider Applicant's response in view of the discussion.

11/28/05  
Date

  
J. Bradley Wright  
Registration No. 47,188

Sean M. McGinn  
Registration No. 34,386

**McGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**